

Serial No. 10/763,153

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed, and reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

CLAIM OBJECTION

Claim 6 was originally objected to because of some informalities.

Responsive to this, claim 6 is amended according to the Examiner's instruction, and it is believed that the objections should be removed.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1-4, 8 and 12 were originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wake (US-2,517,264).

In addition, claims 1, 2 and 4-8 were originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Beaucage (US-2,353,989).

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 9-11 were originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wake in view of Maier (US-4,539,881).

Responsive to this, claim 1 is amended so as to make the claimed invention more distinguishably patentable over the prior art references cited by the Examiner. Applicant also submits the following comments.

The claimed invention discloses "a protractor and ruler combination, comprising a main ruler, a secondary ruler, and an auxiliary ruler, wherein: the main ruler has a first side integrally formed with a protractor having a plurality scales; the secondary ruler is rotatably mounted on the main ruler and has a plurality reading scales; and the auxiliary ruler has a first side combined with the secondary ruler, so that the secondary ruler is moved in concert with the auxiliary ruler on the protractor of the main ruler" as disclosed in the amended claim 1.

With reference to the Wake reference, it disclosed a measuring device comprising a main ruler 2, a secondary ruler 23, and an auxiliary ruler 7.

Serial No. 10/763,153

In comparison, in the Wake reference, the protractor 5 is movably mounted on the main ruler 2. Therefore, the protractor 5 is not formed on the main ruler 2. Thus, the Wake reference does not teach "the main ruler has a first side integrally formed with a protractor" as disclosed in the amended claim 1 of the claimed invention.

In addition, in the Wake reference, the secondary ruler 23 is formed on the auxiliary ruler 7. Thus, the Wake reference does not teach "the auxiliary ruler has a first side combined with the secondary ruler" as disclosed in the amended claim 1 of the claimed invention.

Further, in the Wake reference, the support member 42 is substantially I-shaped and movably mounted on the ruler section of the main ruler 2. Therefore, the support member 42 is not flattened and is not pivotally mounted on the ruler section of the main ruler 2. In addition, the pivot shaft is not fixed in the fixing hole 13 of the ruler section. Thus, the Wake reference does not teach "the ruler section of the main ruler has a distal end formed with a fixing hole, and the protractor and ruler combination further comprises a flattened support member pivotally mounted on the ruler section of the main ruler, and a pivot shaft extended through an end of the support member and fixed in the fixing hole of the ruler section" as disclosed in the amended claim 3 of the claimed invention.

Further, in the Wake reference, the secondary ruler 23 has a sector shape. Thus, the Wake reference does not teach "the secondary ruler has a semi-circular shape" as disclosed in the claim 4 of the claimed invention.

Further, in the Wake reference, the secondary ruler 23 has a periphery located outside of the scales 27 of the protractor 5. Thus, the Wake reference does not teach "the reading scales of the secondary ruler have sizes determined according to an inner diameter of the scales of the protractor, and the secondary

Serial No. 10/763,153

ruler has a periphery located inside of the scales of the protractor" as disclosed in the amended claim 12 of the claimed invention.

Further, in the Wake reference, the periphery of the secondary ruler 23 and the inner diameter of the scales 27 of the protractor 5 does not form a circle. Thus, the Wake reference does not teach "the periphery of the secondary ruler and the inner diameter of the scales of the protractor form a circle" as disclosed in the new added claim 13 of the claimed invention.

With reference to the Beaucage reference, it disclosed a geometric instrument comprising a main ruler 31, a secondary ruler 30, and an auxiliary ruler 32.

In comparison, in the Beaucage reference, the secondary ruler 30 is protruded upward from the supporting member 28 and rotatably mounted on the protractor 22, and the main ruler 31 is fixed on the secondary ruler 30 to rotate the secondary ruler 30. Therefore, the main ruler 31 is rotatable relative to the protractor 22. Thus, the Beaucage reference does not teach "the main ruler has a first side integrally formed with a protractor" as disclosed in the amended claim 1 of the claimed invention.

In addition, in the Beaucage reference, the main ruler 31 is fixed on the secondary ruler 30 to rotate the secondary ruler 30. Therefore, secondary ruler 30 is not rotatably mounted on the main ruler 31. Thus, the Beaucage reference does not teach "the secondary ruler is rotatably mounted on the main ruler" as disclosed in the amended claim 1 of the claimed invention.

Further, in the Beaucage reference, the secondary ruler 30 has an arcuate shape. Thus, the Beaucage reference does not teach "the secondary ruler has a semi-circular shape" as disclosed in the claim 4 of the claimed invention.

Further, in the Beaucage reference, the nut 35 is rested on the protractor 22 as shown in Fig. 6. Therefore, the nut 35 is not rested on the auxiliary ruler 32.

Serial No. 10/763,153

Thus, the Beaucage reference does not teach "a screw member extended through the guide slot of the protractor, the through bore of the secondary ruler and the through bore of the auxiliary ruler, and a nut screwed on the screw member and rested on the first side of the auxiliary ruler" as disclosed in the amended claim 6 of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, from the above mentioned descriptions, it is apparent that the claims 1-13 of the claimed invention have disclosed a protractor and ruler combination whose construction and function are quite different from and patentably distinguishable over the Wake and Beaucage references. It is believed that Wake and Beaucage references, whether taken alone or in combination with the Maier reference do not render obvious the claimed invention.

Therefore, it is believed that, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 103(a) should be withdrawn, and the claims 1-13 should be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the application is now in a condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, he is urged to contact Applicant's attorney at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Kun-Li Xieh



by Alan D. Kamrath

Attorney for Applicant

Nikolai & Mersereau, P.A.

900 Second Avenue South

Suite 820 International Centre

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3813

Telephone: (612) 339-7461

Facsimile: (612) 349-6556

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKewed/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER: _____**

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.